

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/578,576	Applicant(s) MASUKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner NICKOLAS HARM	Art Unit 1791	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NICKOLAS HARM.

(3) Jarrett L. Silver.

JLS

(2) Mark Osele.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 August 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 2, and 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: NARUSE, PEARSON.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed how/whether applicant's heat treatment may have given rise to claimed properties. No conclusion reached. Suggested that perhaps properties were unexpected, but applicant's representative requires more information from applicant before discussing/amending claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.